

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments, and the following remarks. Claims 8-20 are in the application. Claims 1-7 have been canceled. Claims 8 and 15 have been amended. Claims 16-20 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Brickman. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 8 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claim 15 has been amended to be placed in independent form and to clarify that each point protrudes through both sides of the mesh. Support for this amendment can be found in the drawing, which shows each point 5 extended through both sides of the mesh. Claims 16-20 correspond to claims 9-13 but depend from claim 15.

In the first sentences of page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that "Figure 10 and 11 show an embodiment where

the barbs are joined to the wire intersections 38, extending obliquely".

The barbed wire structure or mat 36, to which the Brickman patent is directed, is the mat 36 overhanging over a fence 38 in figures 10 and 11, as stated in column 2, lines 46-52: "Figure 10 shows a mat 36 used as an overhang on a fence 38. This mat differs from the previous mat in having the barbs welded to the longitudinal strands. Figure 11 is similar to Figure 10, but discloses a mat 28 having the barbs welded to the cross wires". Thus, reference number 38 makes reference to the fence, and not to the intersections, as the Examiner has mistakenly interpreted.

However, even considering the fence 38 as part of the Brickman invention, no barb is welded to the wire intersections, since the fence 38 is a mesh of wires without any sharp points. On the other hand, the mat 36 is formed of a number of strands or wires, the barbs being joined either to the longitudinal strands (fig. 10) or to the cross wires (fig. 11), but never to the intersections between wires or strands. Furthermore, the method

followed to make the barbed wire of the Brickman patent (Column 2, lines 10-13) can never render the barbs at the intersections. As explained in the previously filed response to the 1st Office Action, having the sharp points welded at the intersections according to the present invention provides the mesh with improved strength.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that no mention is made in the Brickman patent, neither in the figures nor in the description, to a mesh having the barbs welded in the intersections of said mesh, and accordingly requests reconsideration of the patentability of Claim 8 of the present US patent application.

Consequently, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9-15, which depend from Claim 8, are not anticipated by Brickman.

Claim 15, and claims 16-20 include the added element that the points extend through both sides of the mesh. This feature is not taught or suggested by Brickmann either.

Accordingly Applicant submits that claims 8-20 are patentable over the cited art.

Respectfully submitted,  
JOSE MARIA CRUZ-SAGREDO GARCIA

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.  
1077 Northern Boulevard  
Roslyn, New York 11576  
(516) 365-9802

Elizabeth C. Richter, Reg. No. 35,103  
Attorney for Applicant

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed electronically in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on June 4, 2008.

~~Elizabeth~~ Collard Richter